Performance review process report

Medway School of Pharmacy, 2021-2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of Medway School of Pharmacy. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

We have:
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Undertook quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed

Through this assessment, we have noted:
- The education provider is working on increasing service user and carer involvement within the programmes and is in the process of recruiting more service users and carers. This was an area of concern highlighted in the previous review they completed and has been identified as an area of risk again during this review. This area has therefore been referred to the focused review process for further exploration.
- Learners were encouraged to provide feedback by the education provider, however there was no strategic approach to gathering this feedback and responding to it. As a result of this, the learner feedback received was limited, which the education provider acknowledged and reflected on. The lack of learner feedback in relation to learner satisfaction was considered to be an area of risk to the quality of the programmes. This area has therefore been referred to the focused review process for further exploration.
- There are appropriate mechanisms in place to receive and respond to external examiner feedback.
- Challenges were experienced with the increase in learner numbers and the loss of some members of staff due to their personal circumstances. The staff:student ratio was therefore relatively high, however this was managed through the work allocation model (WAM).
- The following areas should be referred to another HCPC process for assessment:
  - The education provider completed a review through the performance review process in 2021 and concerns were highlighted in relation to service user and carer involvement. The information submitted via the portfolio for this current review has highlighted the same concerns relating to this area

and the visitors agreed insufficient progress had been made to address these concerns. This area has therefore been identified as a risk and has been referred to the focused review process for further exploration.
- o The lack of feedback from learners in relation to learner satisfaction posed a significant risk to the quality of the programmes. This area has therefore been identified as a risk and has been referred to the focused review process for further exploration.
- The provider should next engage with monitoring in two years, the 2024-25 academic year, because:
  - o Through this review, visitors have raised concerns about service user and carer involvement and the lack of learner feedback. Both these concerns have been referred to the focused review process and will be explored further via this route.
  - o The education provider does not have established data points but are working with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data.

Previous consideration	The education provider previously engaged with the performance review process through the Pilot in 2021. This is therefore their second engagement with this process.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: • when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be. • whether issues identified for referral through this review should be reviewed, and if so how.
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: • Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2024-25 academic year. • Subject to the Panel's decision, we will undertake further investigations as per section 5.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:
- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are approved on an open-ended basis, subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:
- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:
- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view on our website.

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this education provider:

Nicholas Haddington	Lead visitor, Independent prescribing
John Head	Lead visitor, Prosthetist / orthotist
Ann Johnson	Service User Expert Advisor
Saranjit Binning	Education Quality Officer

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require

profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we did not require professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because the lead visitors were satisfied they could assess performance and risk without needing to consider professional areas outside of their own.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers three HCPC-approved programmes across two post-registration entitlements. It provides undergraduate, postgraduate and short courses, all in the profession of pharmacy. This includes delivering post-registration areas for HCPC regulated professions which have access to prescribing rights. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2006. The Medway School of Pharmacy have partnerships between the University of Greenwich and University of Kent. It is recognised as a school of pharmacy and is accredited by the General Pharmaceutical Council.

The last annual monitoring in the legacy model of quality assurance model was 2019-20.

The Medway School of Pharmacy engaged with the major change process in the legacy model of quality assurance model in 2021. The change was the introduction of a new prescribing programme in the form of a module that sits within MSc Advanced Clinical Practice programme, which is delivered by the University of Greenwich.

The education provider was included as a pilot provider when the current quality assurance model was being developed. The outcome of the review was for the education provider to receive continued approval for the programmes and it was agreed the next review period would be 2022-23. During this review the following areas were identified as risks:
- Data – the HCPC rely on data to understand the education providers performance. These data points were not available, and it was therefore difficult for visitors to make a judgement on performance, hence the reason for them receiving a two-year review period. It was noted the education provider should consider developing these data points for future reporting purposes.
- Involvement of service users – the education provider only had one service user and one carer supporting the programmes. The panel noted the involvement of service users with the programmes should be followed up in future reporting.

- Mechanism for seeking external examiner feedback – there was a lack of standard reporting and feedback from external examiners, and this was due to the external examiner system changing.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level	Approved since
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing		2006

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes[1].

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	473	402	2023	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission. The education provider is recruiting learners below the benchmark.

[1] An explanation of the data we use, and how we use this data, is available here

				We explored this further with the education provider through Quality theme 1.
Learner non continuation	3%	10%	2020-21	This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from a combination or other HEI. This means the data is formed out of a combination of data for associated institutions / the data from a related Higher Education Institution (HEI). The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 7%. We explored this by considering the reflections provided in the portfolio.
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	100%	2019-20	This HESA data was sourced from a combination or other HEI. This means the data is formed out of a combination of data for associated institutions / the data from a related HEI. The data in the value column has been submitted by the education provider. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's

				performance has improved by 6%. We explored this by considering the reflections provided in the portfolio.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	N/A	N/A	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided to establish this data point through the next submission.
Learner satisfaction	N/A	N/A	2022	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided to establish this data point through the next submission. Learner satisfaction was explored further through Quality theme 3.

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the thematic areas reviewed section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their portfolio. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider was performing well against our standards.

We have reported on how the provider is performing on all areas, including the areas below, through the Summary of findings section.

Quality theme 1 – Impact of the increased learner numbers on resources

Area for further exploration: Visitors noted the education providers reflection on the challenges they experienced with staff turnover and acknowledged the increase with learner numbers from 130 to 201. This raised some concerns for the visitors, with regards to the impact this increase in learner numbers would have on the support available to learners and attrition rates. Further information was therefore requested from the education provider on their approach to reviewing and monitoring the staff:student ratio. This was to ensure it was appropriate and not too high. Clarification was also sought on the education provider's approach to managing staff absences for long periods and how this has been managed recently with the loss of staff and the freeze on recruitment.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email clarification from the education provider. The visitors considered the email clarification would be the most effective method for the provider to respond to the queries they had.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained how the work allocation model (WAM) was used to identify an appropriate staff:student ratio, which was monitored by the programme lead. They demonstrated they had an effective process in place to manage the staff:student ratio and ensure staffing levels were adequate. Reflections were provided on the current staff:student ratio and how they considered this to be high. To reduce this they consulted with the senior management team to recruit an additional 0.3 FTE, but due to the recruitment freeze this was not possible. However, to address this issue and provide additional support the education provider contracted an hourly paid lecturer who they use on various aspects of the programmes when required. They also noted how learner numbers had decreased from the planned 180 to 153, which clearly reduced some of the pressure on staff with supporting learners.

With regards to covering periods of staff absence, the team have a shared inbox where learners are directed to, which enables staff to respond to issues and queries in the absence of their colleagues. Learner files are also stored on Microsoft Teams and staff are able to access these and the correspondence logs to pick up any issues and provide learners with the support required.

Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

<u>Quality theme 2 – Increasing service user and carer involvement</u>

Area for further exploration: Visitors expressed concerns regarding the reflection on the involvement of services users and carers with the programmes. This was recognised as an ongoing issue, which had been identified in the previous performance review. The education provider engaged with the pilot when the HCPC were developing the current quality assurance model. In the reflections provided, they indicated they were seeking to increase service user and carer involvement. However, the current portfolio did not include reflections about how or whether this area had been developed since the last performance review.

Based on the information provided, the visitors requested for more information about the number of service user and carer representatives involved with the programmes. In addition to this, visitors also sought further reflections from the education provider on their plans to increase service user and carer involvement and input with the programmes and their plans on developing a service user and carer strategy.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email clarification from the education provider. The visitors considered the email clarification would be the most effective method for the provider to respond to the queries they had.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider confirmed they were in the process of increasing the number of service users and carers involved with the programmes and were in contact with two individuals who were interested in being involved.

With regards to increasing service user and carer input, the education provider explained how they encourage service users and carers to engage with all aspects of the programmes. For example, they are involved with the programme design, attending programme planning boards and involvement with the Practical Assessments of Prescribing Practice.

The education provider submitted a strategy document, which outlined the input of service users and carers on the programmes. Visitors reviewed this document and concluded it was a policy outlining the action they would be taking to develop a strategic plan and the objective of this. Visitors confirmed the document defined what the strategic aims and objectives were. However, they remained concerned because the response did not provide sufficient evidence on how they intended to increase the number of service users and carers involved with the programmes.

Given this area was identified previously as a risk, visitors were not confident the education provider had taken the appropriate action to develop this area and viewed this as a continued risk. They acknowledged how the education provider were intending to increase the number of service users and carers involved with the programmes, however noted insufficient progress had been made in the past two years. It was therefore agreed this area would be explored further through the focussed review process to review the progress made with developing this area.

<u>Quality theme 3 – Receiving feedback from learners and considering outcomes</u>

Area for further exploration: Visitors recognised the low level of feedback received from learners and acknowledged the National Student Survey (NSS) did not apply to the programmes. To address this issue, the education provider introduced some initiatives to support learner feedback, which were the 'you said – we did' log and the 'How are we doing' initiative, which the visitors noted. Given the low level of feedback received by the education provider, visitors had expected to review data and reflections regarding the type of learner feedback provided, metrics and an action plan of improvements, however these were not included in the reflections provided. Further information was therefore requested on the response rate for learner feedback and a reflection on if this had improved with the new initiatives. In addition to this, visitors also sought further reflections on how feedback and outcomes were considered.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email clarification from the education provider. The visitors considered the email clarification would be the most effective method for the provider to respond to the queries they had.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained the two methods they use to gather feedback, outlined above. Learners were encouraged to provide feedback via these routes, however the education provider recognised the response rate was still low. Visitors noted these two routes for learners to provide feedback, but did not consider these to be satisfactory, as the 'you said – we did' log was used as a method of telling learners what action had been taken in response to their feedback. The 'How are we doing' log was an ad-hoc method of learners providing feedback and neither of these methods were considered effective in gathering feedback by the visitors.

The education provider are aware learner feedback rates are low and because of this they do not log or monitor these rates. Instead, they encourage learners to provide informal feedback verbally to their tutors, which is then added to the log and discussed at team meetings. Visitors did not consider this approach to be strategic and were unable to see evidence of a functional and effective strategy to gather learner feedback.

In the response, they confirmed they were in the process of developing metrics with regards to learner feedback. To assist with this, a learning technologist has been employed to develop an automatic system to request feedback from learners. Visitors noted the actions taken to develop metrics and increase the level of formal feedback received from learners but did not consider the measures taken to be adequate.

Overall, the visitors were not satisfied with the approach taken by the education provider to gathering learner feedback and considered this represented a significant risk to the quality of the programmes and the learner experience. It was also noted, there were gaps with the data points, which was due to the nature of their provision however they are currently working with the HCPC to develop these. It was therefore agreed this area would be explored further through the focussed review process to review the progress made with developing this area.

Quality theme 4 – Receiving feedback from external examiners

Area for further exploration: Previously, the education provider engaged with the pilot of the performance review. During this review there were concerns identified in relation to the process for receiving and considering external examiner feedback. To ensure this issue had been addressed, the visitors requested further information on what mechanisms the education provider had to receive feedback from external examiners and how this was considered and responded to.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email clarification from the education provider. The visitors considered the email clarification would be the most effective method for the provider to respond to the queries they had.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider confirmed the external examiners provided feedback once a year via Microsoft Forms. Feedback was also gathered at the exam board verbally and actioned accordingly and all comments received from the external examiners were considered and responded to by the programme lead.

Visitors were satisfied with the actions taken in response to the previous concerns raised and confirmed the education provider were performing well in this area.

Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability** –

  - The education provider reflected on the high turnover of staff in 2021, which included resignations for various reasons and staff reducing their hours. This has been particularly challenging for them partly due to the recruitment freeze that was applied during the pandemic, resulting in not being able to replace staff which impacted the teams workloads. In April 2022, they recruited additional staff and increased hours for some existing members of staff. Learners have benefitted from the recruitment of new staff, as this allowed the team to increase the clinical experience they offer.

- o The education provider secured funding from NHS England for various contracts, such as the Pharmacy Integration Funding contract and a contract to deliver some short courses to hospitals and pharmacists in the London and Southeast region.
- o Visitors recognised there were financial challenges for Higher Education Institutions. However, the education provider confirmed they were in a good position financially, with recruitment for all programmes being stable.
- o The staff:student ratio was explored through Quality theme 1 and further clarification was provided on how this was reviewed and monitored.
- o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section and acknowledged appropriate measures were in place to address the area explored through the quality activity, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

- **Partnerships with other organisations** –

  - o The education provider demonstrated they have a strong relationship with the University of Greenwich and work in partnership with them on various projects. This included seeking approval from the NMC for an optional module, which they wanted to promote to the Allied Health Professionals (AHP).
  - o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

- **Academic and placement quality** –

  - o They reflected on the changes made due to the professional body requirements and how they undertook a review of the curriculum. A portfolio review meeting took place with staff, a carer and a learner representative to review the portfolio. The outcome of this review was to make no changes to the learning outcomes, however they were required to make some changes to the portfolio. These improvements benefitted learners on placement and enabled staff to monitor their progress. These changes continue to be evaluated and reflected on.
  - o To ensure teaching is delivered to a high standard there is a peer review system, which all lecturers are involved in. They have reflected on the benefits of being observed by their peers and how the feedback received enabled them to change delivery methods to improve the quality of teaching.
  - o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, as it demonstrated there were continuous improvements being made to the quality of teaching.
  - o They were satisfied the education provider was performing well in this area.

- **Interprofessional education** –

  - Interprofessional education was clearly embedded within the programmes and the education provider reflected on this positively. The approach to interprofessional education was for learners from different professions to teach and learn from each other. Where possible, learners were mixed with different professional backgrounds to ensure they were able to maximise the opportunities available. The feedback received from learners on this approach has been positive.
  - Visitors commented on how the education providers approach to interprofessional education allowed for the sessions to be tailored to the different professional backgrounds and to cross over at certain points.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

- **Service users and carers** –

  - Reflections were provided on how service users engaged with the delivery of the Practical Assessing Prescribing Practice (PAPP) online, which involved them acting as patients. The education provider recognised the benefits of the feedback provided to learners and confirmed service users and carers would continue to be involved with the development and delivery of the PAPPs.
  - They acknowledged the requirement to increase the number of service users and carers involved with the programmes and confirmed they were working on developing this area further. Through Quality theme 2 visitors explored service user and carer input further, as this was identified as an area of risk in their previous review.

- **Equality and diversity** –

  - There is a clear commitment to equality and diversity and recently the education provider updated their Equality, Diversity, and Inclusivity (EDI) policies to include gender equality. In addition to this they introduced an EDI session, which was part of the content delivered on study days. The purpose of the session was to focus on the role and importance of EDI in the profession and to increase awareness with learners.
  - To ensure inclusion and accessibility for learners, teaching and learning materials were reviewed externally. Recommendations on the language used and presentation of it were considered and actioned accordingly, which included some updates on Moodle, the Virtual Learning Environment
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

- **Horizon scanning** –

  o The education provider continuously considers ways of updating resources and developing the programmes. For example, they have included a Simulator Patient to the list of resources they offer learners and have developed a short clinical skills programme. There is clear evidence of them wanting to enhance the clinical element of the programme and to deliver it at an advanced level.
  o They have reflected on how they have used the advanced clinical practitioners on some sessions and are considering how they can develop the work they undertake with 'pharmacists working towards consultant status' further. They are currently working with partners in Sussex on this and would like to introduce a similar model for the Medway area.
  o Other developments include the introduction of a new module on using medicines, specifically for the AHPs. The purpose of developing this module is to increase awareness of how to manage medicines and apply prescribing in practice.
  o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

Risks identified which may impact on performance:

Service users and carers

Risks in this area were highlighted in the review the education provider completed through the pilot in 2021. Referrals were made then to the next performance review, however despite this there is no evidence of them responding to these concerns and this area therefore continues to be an area of risk. It was noted one service user and one carer was involved with the delivery of the programmes and the education provider were in the process of increasing service user and carer involvement, however insufficient progress was made with this. Other than the involvement with the PAPP assessments, input from service users and carers was limited. There was also no clear strategy on how this area would be developed and service user and carer involvement would be increased.

Outstanding issues for follow up:

Service users and carers

Given the lack of progress and development in this area, visitors were not assured that the area of risk was being robustly addressed and developed. They confirmed it continued to be an area of risk and required further monitoring. Visitors recommended the education provider should develop an action plan with clear timescales identified to develop a service user and carer strategy. This will be explored further through the focussed review process, which will focus on SET 3.7: Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**

  - It was not appropriate for the education provider to provide a reflection in this area, due to the post-registration aspect of their provision.
  - Visitors identified no concerns in this area and were satisfied.

- **Impact of COVID-19** –

  - During the pandemic all activities were moved online. The education provider reflected on the positive engagement with online meetings and how it provided flexibility and efficiency from a time perspective for both learners and tutors.
  - To ensure learners were supported during this period they offered a range of sessions for learners to engage with. This included podcast sessions, 'getting to know you' sessions, support seminars and 'natter' (networking) sessions. As learners have returned to face to face delivery the 'getting to know you' sessions and 'natter' (networking) sessions have been phased out. The benefits of the other support sessions have been recognised and they will therefore continue to offer these to learners.
  - In addition to the above, they introduced a 'do what you can when you can' policy to support learners with completing the programmes and moved the Practice Assessment of Prescribing Practice (PAPP) exam online. The purpose of both these initiatives was to reduce the stress experienced by learners.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section and noted the innovative techniques used to support learners. They were satisfied the education provider was performing well in this area.

- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** –

  - Reflections were provided on how changes were made to the delivery of the BNF/Pharmacology exam due to the changes with the paper version of the BNF. Due to the BNF not being available as a paper version from September 2023 the delivery method of the exam changed to online and Moodle will be used to facilitate this. Other developments have included the increased use of a simulation patient and the delivery of the PAPP exam online.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section and noted the good use of technologies. They were satisfied the education provider was performing well in this area.

- **Apprenticeships** –

  - It was not appropriate for the education provider to provide a reflection in this area, due to the post-registration aspect of their provision.
  - Visitors identified no concerns in this area and were satisfied.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education** –
  - o It was not appropriate for the education provider to provide a reflection in this area, due to the post-registration aspect of their provision.
  - o Visitors identified no concerns in this and were satisfied.

- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies** –

  - o It was not appropriate for the education provider to provide a reflection in this area, due to the post-registration aspect of their provision.
  - o Visitors identified no concerns in this and were satisfied.

- **Office for Students monitoring** –

  - o It was not appropriate for the education provider to provide a reflection in this area, due to the post-registration aspect of their provision.
  - o Visitors identified no concerns in this and were satisfied.

- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies** –

  - o They have demonstrated they work closely with the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and reflected on the recent accreditation and the changes made to the programme for Pharmacists.
  - o One of the changes entailed learners passing all components of the module, which resulted in a new module being produced. They confirmed these changes did not impact learners from other professions and noted how the programmes continued to provide interprofessional education for all learners.
  - o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Curriculum development** –
  - o The education provider recognised the use of supplementary prescribing with AHPs had reduced and independent prescribing was

used more. To increase awareness of this they used the clinical management plans, which were incorporated into reflective statements by learners to encourage them to reflect on the uses of supplementary practice. As a result of this change, the session delivered on clinical management plans was changed to facilitate discussion with learners. The session allowed learners to develop their understanding of supplementary prescribing and the limitations of it with other professions.

- o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section and noted the reflections provided on the clinical management plans and how these were used. They were satisfied the education provider was performing well in this area.

- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance** –

  - o The education provider demonstrated their engagement with professional bodies. They updated the Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme to reflect the new standards that were updated by the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS). They also responded to requests from the GPhC and made changes accordingly.
  - o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section and noted how the education provider responded to changes and updated programmes to reflect these. They were satisfied the education provider was performing well in this area.

- **Capacity of practice-based learning** –

  - o Due to the nature of the provision, learners were required to source their own placements and this was made clear to them at the admissions stage. They reflected on how some learners experienced difficulties with this, however there were no concerns identified in this area.
  - o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learners** –
  - o Reflections were provided on the lack of feedback obtained from learners. To address this issue, the education provider introduced mechanisms by which feedback could be gathered. They introduced a 'you said – we did' log and a 'How are we doing' evaluation tool for learners to provide feedback. Learners were also able to provide

feedback directly to their tutors via the Practice Portfolio Review (PPR) meetings.

- o Through Quality theme 3 we explored the low levels of feedback from learners and further reflections were provided by the education provider on how they would increase this and consider feedback from learners.

- **Practice placement educators** –

  - o They recognised they had no mechanism to gather feedback from practice educators and therefore introduced a process by which it could be gathered through the Practice Portfolio Review meeting, which takes place at the start of a placement. Since the introduction of this they reflected on how practice educators were being provided with better support. Additional resources were also added to the website for practice educators to access and use for support purposes.
  - o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section and noted how the education provider had implemented a process for gathering feedback from practice educators. They were satisfied the education provider was performing well in this area.

- **External examiners** –

  - o There are robust processes in place to ensure external examiners are involved with the teaching and assessment of learners and provide appropriate feedback. The education provider reflected on the positive feedback they received from external examiners.
  - o In the previous review completed, this area was identified as an area of risk due to the difficulties experienced with obtaining external examiner feedback, however a positive reflection has been provided in relation to this. Through Quality theme 4 we confirmed there were no concerns in this area.
  - o Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: The lack of feedback from learners and data points in relation to learner satisfaction posed a significant risk to the quality of the programmes. Visitors were concerned the education provider did not have a strategic approach to gathering feedback. In addition to this there was no evidence of how the education provider responded to issues or made improvements to the programmes.

Outstanding issues for follow up: The education provider did not provide appropriate reflections on how learner feedback was gathered and considered in relation to assessing learner satisfaction. Visitors considered this to be a significant risk which would impact the quality of the provision and therefore recommended these should be addressed and reviewed as a matter of priority. It is therefore appropriate to use the focussed review process to explore these issues further.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learner non continuation:**
  - o Based on the figures submitted by the education provider the total number of learners they had were 201 and from this figure 21 learners withdrew for various reasons. They reflected on this and explained the various reasons for them withdrawing, such as personal circumstances and health. When making the decision to withdraw, the education provider ensured all learners were provided with support and all options were discussed with them.

- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - o This data point was 100%, as all learners on the programmes must be in employment.
  - o Visitors confirmed they were satisfied with this data point and had no concerns.

- **Teaching quality:**
  - o Due to the nature of their provision, this data point does not apply to the education provider.

- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - o The education provider confirmed they do not engage with the National Student Survey (NSS), as this does not apply to their provision. However, gathering learner feedback through other mechanisms was explored through Quality theme 3.

- **Programme level data:**

  - o The education provider experienced a growth in learner numbers and confirmed they currently have six cohorts a year of 30 learners. Based on the data provided, visitors requested further clarification on the learner numbers, as it was not clear to them if they had 180 or 201 learners. In the portfolio the education provider had stated they had 201 learners but, in their response, they referenced 180 learners. The HCPC explored this issue further and concluded there were 201 learners across the whole provision, however 21 learners withdrew which resulted in there being 180 learners. To break this figure down further the 180 learners was a planned figure and in reality, the education provider had a reduced number of learners, which was 153. Visitors accepted the explanation from the HCPC Executive.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: The education provider acknowledged the lack of data points and recognised this was due to the nature of their provision. They understand the importance of data points and were keen to work with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data.

Outstanding issues for follow up: The education provider will work with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data points and will reflect on these in their next performance review.

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval or focused review process).

Referrals to the focused review process

<u>Service user and carer involvement</u>

Area(s) of practice applicable to:
- Prescribing

Programme(s) applicable to:
- Non medical prescribing programme

Summary of issue:

In 2021, the education provider engaged with this process as part of the pilot and during this review specific risks in this area were highlighted. At the time, the visitors agreed to refer this area to the next performance review. This area was therefore considered in this current review and based on the information submitted in the portfolio it suggests the education provider have still not fully addressed this area of concern. It was noted only one service user and one carer were involved with the delivery of the programmes during this current review period. The education provider stated they were in the process of increasing service user and carer involvement, however the current visitors were not satisfied with this explanation and were concerned with the limited progress made in this area, given this was highlighted in the previous review as an area of risk. Other than the involvement with the PAPP assessments, input from service users and carers was still limited. There was also no clear strategy on how this area would be developed and service user and carer involvement would be increased.

Given the lack of progress and development in this area, visitors were concerned the area of risk was not being robustly addressed and developed. They confirmed it continued to be an area of risk that required further monitoring. Visitors recommended the education provider should develop an action plan with clear timescales identified to develop a service user and carer strategy. The progress with increasing the number of service users and carers involved with the programmes should also be monitored. Due to the risks identified, the current visitors considered the risk as significant and recommended these should be addressed and reviewed as a matter of priority. It is therefore appropriate to use the focussed review process to explore these issues further. The focus will be on how they meet SET 3.7: Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

<u>Receiving feedback from learners and considering outcomes</u>
Area(s) of practice applicable to:
- Prescribing

Programme(s) applicable to:
- Non medical prescribing programme

Summary of issue: The lack of feedback from learners in relation to learner satisfaction posed a significant risk to the quality of the programmes. Visitors were concerned the education provider did not have a strategic approach to gathering feedback. In addition to this there was no evidence of how the education provider responded to issues or made improvements to the programmes.

It was clear there was no strategy to obtain learner feedback or anyway of assessing learner satisfaction. Visitors considered this to be a significant risk which would impact the quality of the provision and therefore recommended these should be addressed and reviewed as a matter of priority. It is therefore appropriate to use the focussed review process to explore these issues further. The focus will be on how they meet SET 3.4: The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:
- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2024-25 academic year.
- The issues identified for referral through this review should be carried out in accordance with the details contained in section 5 of this report.

Reason for next engagement recommendation
- Internal stakeholder engagement
  - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engaged with one professional body. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
  - The education provider engaged with GPhC, RPS and NMC. They considered the findings of professional bodies in improving their provision.
  - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
  - Through this review, the education provider has not established how they will supply quality and performance data points which are equivalent to those in external supplies available for other organisations. Where data is not regularly supplied, we need to understand risks by engaging with the education provider on a frequent basis (a maximum of once every two years)

- In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a two year monitoring period is:
  - o Through this review, visitors have raised concerns about service user and carer involvement and the lack of learner feedback. Both these concerns have been referred to the focused review process and will be explored further via this route.
  - o The education provider does not have established data points but are working with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
Non-Medical Prescribing	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/10/2020
Postgraduate Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing	DL (Distance learning)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/01/2014
Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing	DL (Distance learning)			Supplementary prescribing	01/05/2006

Appendix 2 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on the next steps for the provider. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation (including their reasons) and any referrals.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Medway School of Pharmacy	CAS-01238-N3M4L3	John Head Nicholas Haddington	2 years	• Through this review, visitors have raised concerns about service user and carer involvement and the lack of learner feedback. Both these concerns have been referred to the focused review process and will be explored further via this route. • The education provider does not have established data points but are working with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data.	• Service user and carer involvement – referred to focused review process. • Obtaining feedback from learners.